UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/50/975
S/1996/443
18 June 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fiftieth session
Agenda item 55
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-first year

Letter dated 17 June 1996 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 17 June 1996, addressed to you by Mr. Osman Ertuğ, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex, which contains a letter sent to you by Mr. Atay A. Raşit, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, could be circulated as a document of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 55, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Tuluy TANÇ
Ambassador
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

ANNEX

Letter dated 17 June 1996 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith the text of a letter dated 17 June 1996 addressed to you by Mr. Atay A. Raşit, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, in connection with the recent visit to United Nations Headquarters of Mr. Alecos Michaelides, the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister, and the remarks he made on the question of Cyprus at an informal meeting of the Security Council on 14 June 1996.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 55, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

APPENDIX

Letter dated 17 June 1996 from Mr. Atay A. Ragit addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the recent visit to United Nations Headquarters in New York of Mr. Alecos Michaelides, the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister, who was given an opportunity to speak at an informal meeting of the Security Council on the question of Cyprus on 14 June 1996.

At the outset, I wish to point out that, for reasons which are well known to all and need not be repeated here, neither Mr. Michaelides nor any member of the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus has the right or authority to represent Cyprus as a whole at the United Nations or anywhere else. Anything he says or does, therefore, is not valid or binding on the Turkish Cypriot side, which is represented by its own democratically elected representatives.

At a time when the question of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) is under consideration by the Security Council and the Secretary-General is expected to present a report on his mission of good offices soon, this visit by Mr. Michaelides, and that of his leader, Mr. Glafcos Clerides, is no doubt aimed at influencing international public opinion in their favour by propagating the Greek Cypriot side's own point of view. It is regrettable, however, that the Turkish Cypriot side, as one of the two directly interested parties to the Cyprus dispute, has not been given a similar opportunity to present its views to the Council members. This is not only against the principle of the political equality of the two sides in Cyprus, envisaged in the relevant Security Council resolutions, and the principle of "equal footing" on which the United Nations-sponsored negotiating process is conducted, but also basic norms of justice.

I am, therefore, addressing this communication to you in the hope that the views presented below will go some way in redressing the utterly imbalanced and unfair situation created by these developments, particularly Mr. Michaelides' one-sided presentation of the issue to the members of the Security Council.

At that meeting, Mr. Michaelides repeated his side's well-known rhetoric of "invasion and occupation" of Cyprus. This unfounded assertion ignores not only the historical facts but also the present realities in the island. Turkey intervened in Cyprus in 1974, in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960, only after the military junta in Greece and its proxies in Cyprus had launched the final attempt to annex the island to Greece (enosis). Before then, the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo had been agitating for enosis for 11 years, causing untold bloodshed and suffering to the Turkish Cypriot population in a severe campaign of ethnic cleansing. The coup d'état was the final episode in this reign of terror and violence, and even Archbishop Makarios, the then leader of the Greek Cypriot community, had called it "an invasion of the island by Greece" from the result of which "the whole people of Cyprus suffers, both Greeks and the Turks". It is ironic that Makarios' words, as part of his speech on 19 July 1974, were spoken in the very building in which Mr. Michaelides unabashedly accused Turkey of invading Cyprus.

/...

Having thus wrongly identified the source of the Cyprus conflict, it was inevitable for Mr. Michaelides to advance the wrong conclusions. His attempt to shift the responsibility for the present deadlock in the negotiations on the Turkish Cypriot side is not borne out by facts. It is useful to recall that, in the long history of the negotiating process, the Turkish Cypriot side has accepted two "draft framework agreements" presented by the United Nations in 1985 and 1986, respectively; 91 out of 100 paragraphs of the United Nations-sponsored "set of ideas" presented in 1992; and the package of confidence-building measures prepared by the United Nations in 1993/94. The Greek Cypriot side has rejected all of the above and refuses to sit at the table with us within the framework of the above parameters and the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979, concluded between the leaders of the two communities under United Nations auspices, on the flimsy excuse that "there is no common ground".

The report from which Mr. Michaelides is said to have quoted at the meeting (S/1994/629 of 30 May 1994), purportedly as evidence of Turkish Cypriot "intransigence", was in fact complemented by a subsequent letter by the Secretary-General, which corrects that assessment and any mistaken impression in that regard (see the letter from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council dated 28 June 1994).

In a more recent demonstration of the Greek Cypriot side's lack of political will to settle the Cyprus issue on a just and lasting basis, Mr. Clerides, contrary to the calculated impression that he had created before, rejected a written proposal by President Rauf Denktaş comprising, inter alia, the Turkish Cypriot side's support for the European Union membership of a Federal Cyprus in return for respect, by the Greek Cypriot side, for our sovereignty and political equality. In the same proposal, which was taken to Mr. Clerides by United States Presidential Emissary, Mr. Richard Beattie, during the latter's visit to the island in December 1995, we had also expressed our willingness to discuss, without prejudice to the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance, the above issues and demilitarization. Unfortunately, this constructive proposal, like the previous ones, foundered on the utter rejection and intransigent stance of the Greek Cypriot leadership.

It is significant to note that, on the issues of membership in the European Union and "demilitarization", the Turkish Cypriot side has repeatedly made it known that it adheres to the relevant paragraphs of the set of ideas, which were carefully negotiated between the United Nations and the two parties, and which are among the parameters of a durable and just solution. It is the Greek Cypriot side which rejects the set of ideas by putting forward totally unrealistic demands, alien to the negotiating process, with the professed aim of doing away with the Treaty of Guarantee as well as other fundamental elements of a realistic solution, in a transparent attempt to bring about the ultimate Greek domination of Cyprus.

Similarly, the Greek Cypriot side is rejecting the signing of a non-aggression agreement between the two sides, repeatedly proposed by President Denktaş, and is blocking the extension of the "unmanning agreement" of 1989, which itself was proposed by President Denktaş in January 1995, both of which could help diffuse the tension along the buffer zone and prevent the recurrence of incidents such as the one which occurred on 3 June 1996 in

Nicosia. Since the facts on this unfortunate incident and our views on the Secretary-General's latest report to the Security Council on the activities of UNFICYP in general, have been, and will further be, communicated to the Council members, I will not go into these in detail. Suffice it to say that the Greek Cypriot side is exploiting what is basically a border incident, which could happen anywhere, by distorting and exploiting it for purely political purposes.

Mr. Michaelides' assertions to the effect that the demographic structure of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is being changed through the influx of people from mainland Turkey is both false and hypocritical. The record shows that it has always been the Greek Cypriot side trying to alter the demographic structure of the island for decades, not only by introducing tens of thousands of settlers from Greece, but also by its ethnic cleansing campaign against the Turkish Cypriots between 1963 and 1974. On the other hand, the introduction, in recent years, of tens of thousands of immigrants from third countries into Southern Cyprus, has drawn the reaction of even the international press, as it has turned Southern Cyprus into a centre for money-laundering, arms and drug smuggling and other illicit activity (see The New York Times of 15 June 1995, The Washington Times of 20 May and 20 June 1995, The Daily Mail of 15 August 1995, L'Express of 6 April 1995 and The Wall Street Journal of 6 May 1996).

As for the alleged emigration of Turkish Cypriots from Northern Cyprus, this is both an exaggeration and the epitome of hypocrisy on the part of the Greek Cypriot side, because the economic and other hardships being faced by the people of Northern Cyprus are the direct result of the inhuman economic, social, cultural and political embargo being imposed on our people by the usurper Greek Cypriot regime in Southern Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot side cannot profess conciliation on the one hand and try to strangulate the Turkish Cypriot people economically and politically on the other.

In the final analysis, Mr. Michaelides' remarks to the members of the Security Council are a testimony to his side's total loss of interest in the negotiating process and its lack of political will to settle the Cyprus issue through dialogue and negotiation. While this is not surprising in view of their unilateral drive to become a member of the European Union, without the Cyprus question being resolved, we hope that the international community will duly warn them about the inevitable consequences of this short-sighted policy, which runs the risk of dividing Cyprus permanently.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 55, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Atay A. RAŞİT
Minister of Foreign Affairs
and Defence